



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,872	03/19/2001	Jared J. Jackson	ARC920010008US1	1256

23334 7590 03/07/2005

FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS, GUTMAN, BONGINI
& BIANCO P.L.
ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER
551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TRONG NHAN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/812,872

Applicant(s)

JACKSON, JARED J.

Examiner

Jack P Nguyen

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/28/05.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-30 are being examined.

Claim Objections

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 10 recites, "...image record, the at least..." The word 'the' appears to be a typo. For the purpose of examination, Examiner interprets the word 'the' to be 'or'. Appropriate correction is required.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Group 1: Claims 1-22 are drawn to a method for determining an image delivery format in response to a request and sending the image to the requester in 709, subclass 246.
- II. Group 2: Claims 23-30 are drawn to a system for storing image information in certain formats for retrieval in class 709, subclass 203.

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. Invention I has a separate utility such as in a method for determining the appropriate image format to send to the recipient according to the capability of the recipient. Invention II has a separate utility such as in a system for storing image formats for retrieval by requesting client. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

These inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, and the search

Art Unit: 2152

required for each Group is different and not co-extensive for examination purpose. For example, the searches for the two inventions would not be co-extensive because these groups would require different searches on PTO's classification class and subclass as following:

(a) Group I search (claims 1-17) would require use of search **Class 709, subclass 246.**

(b) Group II search (claims 18-36) would require use of search **Class 709, subclass 203.**

A telephone call was conducted with Mr. Jose Gutman, the applicant's representative, on February 28, 2005 to address the possibility of a restriction election. The applicant selected group II without traverse.

Claims 23-30 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-22 are now presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

On February 28, 2005, the applicant informed the Examiner the information disclosure statement filed 6/26/01 is incorrectly filed. The applicant re-filed the corrected copy of IDS on 2/28/05 via fax. Therefore, the IDS filed on 6/26/01 was not considered and the corrected copy is initialized and attached herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2152

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-15 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al, 6,779,040 (Lee hereafter).

As per claims 3 and 13, A system comprising: at least one networked device (104, fig. 1; col. 4, lines 31-32; client computer is a network device); and a content server for delivering content information to the at least one networked device (102, fig. 1; col. 4, line 42-46; server provides image content to client devices), the content server including: a first memory for storing at least one of an image delivery parameter and an image presentation parameter associated with a networked device (col. 4, lines 11-15; server stores user device's capabilities and preferences associated with the images stored on the device); a network interface for communicating with a network link communicatively coupled with the at least one networked device (network interface is an inherent component of a network device); a controller, communicatively coupled to the first memory and to the network interface (controller is an inherent component of server device); and a second memory, communicatively coupled to the controller, for storing computer instructions for the controller to control the content server for (also inherent component of server device for processing client requests): receiving a request for delivery of content information to the at least one networked device, the content information comprising image information (col. 4, lines 18-23; server receives requests from client for image data); and determining, based on at least one of an image delivery parameter and an image presentation parameter associated with the at least one

Art Unit: 2152

networked device, an image format for the image information for delivery of the image information to the at least one networked device and for presentation of the image information at the at least one networked device (col. 4, lines 18-23; upon receiving the image request from a client, the server retrieves the image file and determines the format of the image file according to the client's capabilities or preferences to be delivered to the client); and providing a response for the request, the response comprising at least a portion of the image information in the image format (col. 4, lines 25-28; server then sends the image response to the client).

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 9 recite similar limitations as claims 3 and 13 and therefore rejected by similar rationale as those claims.

As per claim 11, Lee discloses a method comprising the steps of: storing at least one of an image delivery parameter and an image presentation parameter associated with a networked device; receiving a request for delivery of information to the networked device, the information comprising displayable image information (see claims 3 and 13 rejection); determining available image formats for the displayable image information (col. 2, lines 35-41; server determines from a plurality of different image formats to send to requesting client); and selecting one of the available image formats, based at least in part on the at least one of an image delivery parameter and an image presentation parameter, for delivery to and presentation at the networked device (col. 2, lines 35-41; after determining from a plurality of image formats, the server selects a best matching version of the image data based on the user's capabilities and sends the image response to the client).

Art Unit: 2152

As per claim 4, Lee teaches couple the response to the network interface, the response being destined for reception by the networked device (col. 4, lines 25-28; server sends response to client device).

As per claims 5-6, Lee teaches the second memory includes computer instruction for the controller to control the server system to: receive, along with the request, the at least one of the image delivery parameter and the image presentation parameter associated with the networked device (col. 4, lines 13-18); and store the at least one of the image delivery parameter and the image presentation parameter in the first memory (col. 4, lines 13-18; server receives user preferences and capabilities along with the request from the user device; server also stores user preferences and capabilities for future reference); server receives the request from one of the networked device and another requester device (inherent from disclosed invention; server is capable to receive and process plurality of requests from plurality of clients).

As per claims 8, 10, 12, and 14, Lee teaches the step of providing a response for the request, the response comprising at least a portion of the displayable image information in the image format; and sending the file to a network interface, the file being destined for reception by the networked device (col. 4, lines 25-28; server sends image response to user's device).

As per claim 15, Lee teaches the first memory comprises a first database for storing records containing image delivery parameters and image presentation parameters associated with the at least one networked device (col. 4, lines 13-15), and a second database for storing at least one image record (col. 4, lines 11-13).

Art Unit: 2152

As per claim 19, Lee teaches image format is selected from a set of image formats including binary bitmap and vector-based graphics (col. 5, lines 27-30; Cartesian volume is the vector-based graphics of JPEG images).

As per claim 20, Lee teaches image format is selected from a set of image formats including JPEG (col. 4, lines 12).

As per claims 21-22, Lee teaches the image delivery parameter corresponds to POTS (114, fig. 1; col. 4, lines 36-38); image presentation parameter corresponds to Desktop Workstation (104, fig. 1; col. 4, lines 32-33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Salo et al, 6,563,800 (Salo hereafter).

As per claims 16-18, Lee discloses determining, based on at least one of an image delivery parameter and an image presentation parameter associated with the at least one networked device, an image format for the image information and image server serving up the image information in the determined image format (see claims 3 and 13 rejection). Lee does not explicitly disclose using Application Programming Interface 'API' calls to start these services. However, it is well known and would have been

Art Unit: 2152

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use API calls between the application program objects and low level interface of the operating system (see Salo disclosure – col. 13, lines 30-37).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Satoh et al, 6,111,662; Yager et al, 5,983,236 ; Himmel, 6,167,441;
Kanevsky, 6,300,947 ; Gourdol et al, 6,100,888 ; Ward et al, US Pub
2001/0010543

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack P Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jpn

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dung C. Dinh', with a stylized, flowing script.

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner